



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 1, 2005

Ms. Debra G. Rosenberg
Atlas & Hall, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 3725
McAllen, Texas 78502-3725

OR2005-04783

Dear Ms. Rosenberg:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 225360.

The McAllen Independent School District (the "school district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to the cost of legal services provided by a named attorney. You state that the school district has provided some of the requested information but claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You claim that some of the submitted information is protected under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the "ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 *et seq.* Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. The ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be: (1) collected and maintained on separate forms; (2) kept in separate medical files; and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a "fitness for duty examination," conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job, is to be treated as a confidential medical record under the ADA as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the

“EEOC”) has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes “specific information about an individual’s disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual.” See Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). However, after careful review of the submitted documents, we find that none of the submitted information is confidential under the ADA, and therefore none of the information may be withheld on that basis under section 552.101.

You also claim that some of the information is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy and section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977) for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. We will therefore consider your claims regarding common-law privacy under section 552.101 together with your claims regarding section 552.102.

This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, this office has found that the following types of information are not excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: information regarding an individual’s profession or business, organizational memberships, or religious affiliation, Open Records Decision No. 674 (2001); job qualifications, including college transcripts, Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987); age, salary, title, and date of employment, Open Records Decision Nos. 455 (1987), 373 (1983); licenses, certificates, and professional awards, Open Records Decision Nos. 444 (1986), 342 (1982); educational background and training, Open Records Decision Nos. 455 (1987), 444 (1986); past work history, Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987), 444 (1986); names, addresses, and telephone numbers of job references, Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987); performance evaluations, Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987), 400 (1983); and reasons for a public employee’s demotion, dismissal, or resignation, Open Records Decision Nos. 444 (1986),

329 (1982), 278 (1981). Therefore, the school district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You also contend that some of the submitted information is confidential under constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently; and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected under constitutional privacy is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). We have considered your arguments and reviewed the information at issue. We conclude, however, that you have not shown that any of this information comes within one of the constitutional zones of privacy or involves the most intimate aspects of human affairs. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470, 455, 444, 423 at 2. We therefore find that none of the remaining submitted information may be withheld on the basis of constitutional privacy.

In summary, the school district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the

Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "L. Joseph James".

L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/sdk

Ref: ID# 225360

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rod Santa Anna, III
109 West Kerria Avenue
McAllen, Texas 78501-9102
(w/o enclosures)